

REMARKS

The following claims are pending in the application: 1 through 21

The following claims have been amended: 1, 3 - 5, 9, 11, 13 - 15, 19, and 21

The following claims have been deleted: Not applicable

The following claims have been added: Not applicable

As a result of the foregoing Amendment, the following claims remain pending in the application: 1 - 21.

Drawing Objections

The Draftsperson has objected to the drawings due to the margins, the character of lines and numbers, and the height of the reference characters.

Applicants are submitting herewith replacement sheets correcting the Draftsperson's grounds for objection. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that the outstanding rejection may be properly withdrawn.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claims 1, 9, 11, 19, and 21 for use of the term "capable of". The Examiner suggests that the term be changed to "operable for".

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's suggestion and have adopted it in the above claim amendments. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's outstanding objection may be properly withdrawn.

The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 through 20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner takes the position that in claims 1 and 11, the term “a plurality of output positions” lacks relationship to the rest of the claim and is not a physical device. Further, in claim 1, the Examiner takes the position that the term “a given light beam” is unclear in that it is not clear whether or not they are all the same given light beam. Additionally, the Examiner takes the position that it is not clear in claim 1 that the term “spatial light modulator” denotes one or more spatial light modulators. In claim 11, the Examiner takes the position that it is not clear that “a given light beam” denotes one or more light beams. Finally, the Examiner takes the position that it is not clear in claim 11 that the term “spatial light modulator” denotes one or more spatial light modulators.

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 11 to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the present invention. Applicants respectfully submit that in light of the present claim amendments the Examiner’s outstanding rejection may be properly withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner’s favorable indication regarding claim 21.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendment and accompanying remarks, the Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is properly in condition for allowance and may be passed to issuance upon payment of the appropriate fees.

Telephone inquiry to the undersigned in order to clarify or otherwise expedite prosecution of the subject application is respectfully encouraged.

Respectfully submitted,

VICTOR ARGUETA-DIAZ
BETTY LISE ANDERSON
STUART A. COLLINS, JR.

Date: May 21, 2003

By:

Michael Stonebrook

Michael Stonebrook
Registration No.: 53,851
Standley & Gilcrest LLP
495 Metro Place South, Suite 210
Dublin, Ohio 43017-5319
Telephone: (614) 792-5555
Facsimile: (614) 792-5536